रजिस्टर्ड नं० पी०/एस० एम० 13.

Jan — to June

हिमाचल प्रदेश

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्यशासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड 36] शिमला, शनिवार, 2 जनवरी, 1988/12 पौष, 1909 [संख्या 1

विषय-सूची

2 जनवरी, 1988/12 पौष, 1909 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'असाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं:—

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
संख्या एफ. डी. एस. ए. (3) 2/82, दिनांक 23 नवम्बर, 1987.	खाद्य एवं आपूर्ति विभाग	हिमाचल प्रदेश व्यापारिक (अनुज्ञापन तथा नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1981 की अनुसूची 1 के भाग "क" में संशोधन, इसके प्राधिकृत अंग्रेजी रूपान्तर सहित।
संख्या डी० एल० आर० 11/87, दिनांक 20 अगस्त, 1987.	विधि विभाग	दि हिमाचल प्रदेश आयुर्वेदिक एण्ड यूनानी प्रैक्टिशनर्स ऐक्ट, 1968 (1968 का 21) का अधिप्रमाणित राजभाषा रूपान्तर।

3180-राजपत्र/87-2-1-88—1,276.

मूल्य : 1 रुपया।

[illegible]

हुए, अनुसूची में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट क्षेत्र को अभ्यारण्य के रूप में उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए तुरन्त घोषित करते है:—

अनुसूची

अभ्यारण का नाम	(क) जिले का नाम: (ख) मण्डल: (ग) क्षेत्र:	हैक्टेयरों में क्षेत्र	अभ्यारण्य का स्थल और परिसीमाएं
रेणुका	(क) सिरमौर (ख) रेणुका (ग) रेणुका	1344.5	उत्तर: शामलात जामू लटयाना और खटनाल, जामू की शामलात धार। दक्षिण: गिरी नदी, तारन की शामलात वनधार और चुलाया तथा दादल शामलात। पूर्व: खाला क्यार गांव की कृषि योग्य भूमि और शामलात वन। पश्चिम: जोगार खड्ड।

आदेशानुसार,
हस्ताक्षरित,
सचिव।

[*Authorised English text of H. P. Govt. Notification No. Fts. (A) 3-6/83, dated 25-3-87, as required under Article 348(3) of the Constitution of India*].

FOREST FARMING & CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, *the 25th March*, 1987

No. Fts. (A) 3-6/83.—Whereas the Goverment of Himachal Pradesh, after due consideration, is of the view that the area mentioned in the Schedule below is of adequate ecological, faunal, floral, geomorphological, natural and zoological significance for the purpose of protection, propogation and development of wild life and its environment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on him under section 18 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 (Act No. 53 of 1972) the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to declare the area as specified in the aforesaid Schedule as sanctuary for the aforesaid purpose with immediate effect:

SCHEDULE

Name of Sanctuary	Name of: (*a*) District (*b*) Division (*c*) Range	Area in hectares	Situation & limits of the Sanctuary
Renuka	(*a*) Sirmaur (*b*) Renuka (*c*) Renuka	1344.5	*North:*—Shamlat Jamu Latyana and Kathnal Shamlat Dhar Jamu. *South:*—Giri River, Shamlat Forest Dhar Taran and Chulaya and Dadel Shamlat. *East:*—Cultivated land and Shamlat Forest of Khala Kiar Village. *West:*—Jogar Khad.

By order,
Sd/-
Secretary.

गृह विभाग

(अनुभाग क)

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171 002, 7 नवम्बर, 1987

संख्या गृह(ए)-एफ(13)-11/87.—यत: केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केन्द्र के प्रयोजन हेतु भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का अधिनियम संख्या 1) के अन्तर्गत भूमि अर्जन के कार्य, राज्य सरकार हिमाचल प्रदेश को भारत सरकार के कृषि एवं ग्रामीण विकास मन्त्रालय द्वारा भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 258 के खण्ड (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना संख्या का0 आ0 782(अ), दिनांक 25-10-1985 द्वारा सुपुर्द किए गए हैं।

और यत: राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामत: गांव डलहौजी, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश में बोर्ड आफ आफिसरज फार प्रोविजन आफ वर्कस सर्विस फार डिपार्टमैंट-41, डब्ल्यू0ई0यू0 के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करना अत्यावश्यक अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश, इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित या अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्य करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

अत्याधिक आवश्यकता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (4) के अधीन यह निदेश देते हैं कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5-ए के उपबन्ध इस मामले में लागू नहीं होंगे।

विनिर्देश

जिला: चम्बा तहसील: भटियात

गांव 1	खसरा नं0 2	क्षेत्रफल एकड़ों में 3
डलहौजी	241/2/2/2	4.7959

आदेश द्वारा,
कुंवर शमशेर सिंह,
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

उद्योग विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 17 नवम्बर, 1987

संख्या उद्योग (छ) 10-5/84-अधि.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश, 3 बीघे 14 बिस्वे भूमि, खसरा नं0 299, गांव सराज माजरा-गुजरां, तहसील नालागढ़, जिला सोलन (हि0प्र0) में जो इस विभाग की अधिसूचना समसंख्या दिनांक 23-12-1985 द्वारा बद्दी/बरोटीवाला में औद्योगिक क्षेत्र के विस्तार हेतु अर्जित करना अपेक्षित किया है, को उक्त अधिसूचना से निकालने हेतु सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं।

शिमला-2, 17 नवम्बर, 1987

संख्या उद्योग(छ)-10-5/84—अधि.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य औद्योगिक विकास निगम समिति शिमला-171001 जो कि भू-अर्जन अधिनियम 1894 की धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी0सी0) के अर्थान्तर्गत सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, द्वारा अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामतः ग्राम सराज माजरा-गुजरां, तहसील नालागढ़, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश में औद्योगिक क्षेत्र विकास हेतु भूमि अर्जित करना अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में खसरा नं0 299 में 3 बीघा 14 बिस्वा भूमि उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन करना अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों, जो इस भूमि से सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी हेतु भूमि-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. उपरोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम के कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों तथा श्रमिकों को उक्त भूमि परिक्षेत्र में प्रवेश करने और इसके किसी भी भाग का सर्वेक्षण करने हेतु सहर्ष प्राधिकृत करते हैं।

4. कोई भी ऐसा हितबद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उपरोक्त भूमि-परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के 30 दिन की अवधि के अन्दर लिखित रूप में भू-अधिग्रहण समाहर्ता (उप-मण्डलीय दण्डाधिकारी), नालागढ़, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के समक्ष आपत्ति प्रस्तुत कर सकता है।

आदेश द्वारा,
ओम यादव,
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 21st November, 1987

No. 19-9/87-Shram.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under Section 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is plesased to publish the awards of Presiding Officer, Labour Court/ Industrial Tribunal, Himachal Pradesh, in the cases detailed below:—

Sl. No.	Case No.	Name of the parties
1.	694/85	S/Shri Narain Dass Roshan Lal Kapoor, S.C. Chaudhary, Mast Ram Susheel and Shesh Pal Sharma *Versus* M/S Vitroc Electronics, Pvt. Ltd. Chambaghat, District Solan, H.P.
2.	517/85	General Secretary, Concrete Poles and Paper Conversion Unit Parwanoo, *Versus* Managing Director, Himachal Pradesh State Industries and Export Corporation Ltd. Shimla-1.

By order,
Secretary (Labour).

Before Sari S.S. Kanwar, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh

Case No. 694 of 1985

S/Shri Narain Dass, Roshan Lal Kapoor, S. C. Chaudhary, Mast Ram Sushil and Sheesh Pal Sharma .. *Petitioners.*

Versus

M/S Vitroc Electronics Pvt. Ltd. Chambaghat District Solan .. *Respondent.*

Shri Dhani Ram for the Petitioners.
Shri R. L. Gupta and V. K. Gupta for the Respondent.

AWARD :

The workmen and management of M/S Vitroc Electronics Pvt. Ltd., Chambaghat, District Solan, arrived at a working settlement Ex. R-1, dated 25-2-1984 under section 19-(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. During the Conciliation proceedings, this settlement was adopted and was duly registered as required under section 18(3) read with sub-section 3 of the Section 12 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The copy of this settlement is Ex. R-2.

The workmen raised demands which were served on the respondent management *vide* notices, the copy of which are Ex. P-1 dated 22-2-1985 ; Ex. P-2, dated 3-4-1985 and Ex. P-3, dated 11-7-1985. These demands have not been acceeded to by the respondent management, who had sent a reply to the workmen *vide* letter Ex. R-6 dated 14-5-1985. The workmen were not satisfied with this reply and they went on strike *w.e.f.* 22-7-1985. During this strike, the respondent initiated disciplinary proceedings against two workmen namely S/Shri Narain Dass and Roshan Lal Kapoor and the Enquiry report is Ex. R-19. The services of S/Shri Narain Dass Rawaut, Roshan Lal Kapoor, S.C. Chaudhary and Sheesh Pal Sharma were terminated *vide* order Ex. R-20, dated 22-7-1985.

The strike of the workmen continued. Mast Ram Sushil misconducted himself and was guilty of violent. He had assaulted Shri I. O. Sharma, Manager of the respondent on 26-7-1985. He had also manhandled Shri Chattar Singh, Driver of the Bus, which had brought the employees of the Respondent to factory site. On this misconduct, the services of Shri Mast Ram Sushil were terminated *Vide* order dated 25-7-1985 (Ex. P-2). The respondent had also been loged with the Police about this incident. The copy of this report is Ex. P-23. The workmen continued their strike.

Inspite of persuation and intervention of the conciliation Officer and the concerned authorities, the workmen did not call off the strike. The strike was prohibited on 7-10-1985 by the Government. The copy of this order Ex. P-24.

Conciliation proceedings were also taken, but these have ultimately failed and reference of the dispute was made to this court *vide* notification, dated 7-10-1985. The following question have been referred :—

> "Whether the dismissal of S/Shri Narain Dass, Roshan Lal Kapoor, S. C. Chaudhary, Mast Ram Sushil and Sheesh Pal Sharma by the Management of M/S Vitroc Electronic Pvt. Ltd. Chambaghar District Solan is justified or otherwise ? Whether the strike of the workmen is legal or otherwise "?

In their claim petition, the workmen had challanged the termination of their services. It is stated by them that all the terminated workmen are the Office bearers of the workers' union and that they had served a demand notice on the management and had also intimated them that in case the demands were not conceded, the workmen would go on strike and that such demand notices were served on the respondent management on 22-2-1985, 9-5-1985 and 11-5-1985, the copies of which are Ex. P-1 to Ex. P-3 , respectively. They have further stated that they had to go on strike because there was no option left with them for getting their demands conceded and that the demands were geniune and they have adopted peaceful means to get them conceded by the respondent management. It has further been contended that the dismissal of all the workmen is illegal and not justifiable.

The respondent management has filed a reply and have stated that the strike of the workmen was illegal, because they have not terminated the settlement arrived at in accordance with the law by service of notice. They have

further stated that all the claimant workmen are guilty of instigating other workmen to go on illegal strike and that Shri Mast Ram Sushil was guilty of violence. It has further been contended that the termination of the claimant workman was justifiable and in accordance with law.

From the arguments of the parties, the following issues arose and were framed by me on 22-1-1986 :—

1. Whether the termination of the services of S/Shri Narain Dass, Roshan Lal Kapoor, S. C. Chaudhary, Mast Ram Sushil and Sheesh Pal Sharma is justified and in order ?

   OPR

2. Whether the strike in question of the workmen was illegal, if so, its effect ?

   (OPP)

3. Relief.

FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 1 & 2 :

Both these issues be taken up together for the sake of convenience. The respondent has examined S/Shri S. D. Modgil, RW 1, I.D.Sharma, RW-2 and Shri Chatter Singh, RW -3 and have tendered in evidence documents Ex. R-1 to Ex. R-23. The claimant workmen have examined S/Shri Suresh Kumar, PW-1, Uttam Singh PW-2, Narain Dass, PW-3 (Petitioner) and Sheesh Pal, PW-4 (Petitioner). They have tendered in evidence documents Ex. P-1 to Ex. P-3.

According to RW-1, Shri S. D. Modgil, the Union of the workers raised demands in February, 1984 and the settlement has been arrived at between the respondent management and the union *vide* settlement Ex. R-1. This settlement, according to him, had been signed by the representatives of the workmen and that of the management on 23-2-1984 . However, this settlement was subjected to the approval of the Board of Directors of the respondent management. The Board had approved this settlement and the same was also approved by the Conciliation Officer, *vide* Ex. R-2, dated 23-5-1984. He has further stated that the workmen had served with the demand notice. The demand notice are Ex. R-3 to Ex. R-5. The copy of these demand notices, Ex-P-1 to Ex. P-3 have also been filed by the Petitioners. It has further been stated by him that Shri Narain Dass Ranout and Roshan Lal Kapoor had started instigating the other workmen to go on strike. The respondent management thereafter approached the Conciliation Officer *vide* letter Ex. R-6, but even during these conciliation proceedings, the workmen went on strike at the instance of Shri Narain Dass and Roshan Lal Kapoor. The respondent management had told the strikers that their strike was illegal and has issued notices to them and also placed the copies on the notice Board and sent the same to their Secretary. The copy of the same has been sent to the Conciliation Officer. The copy this notice is Ex. R-8.

It is further stated that on 16-5-1985, Narain Dass and Roshan Lal Kapoor again asked the workers' to continue the strike. He has further stated that Narain Dass sent a notice, dated 16-5-1985, to the respondent management. The copy of this notice is Ex. R-9.

It is further stated that Narain Dass and Roshan Lal Kapoor were suspended *vide* orders, dated 18-5-1985. The copies of orders are Ex. R-10 and Ex. R-11. and that both of them had replied to the notices/charge-sheets. The copies of their replies are Ex. R-12 and Ex. R-13 respectively. It is further stated that the Conciliation Officer had been informed by the respondent management about the strike *vide* letter Ex. R-14. He initiated the proceedings and the respondent management and the workmen appeared before him on 29-5-1985 and that the respondent had also filed the letter, the copy of which is Ex. R-2 on 29-5-1985. The Concilitation Officer corded the proceedings on 11-7-1985. The workmen thereafter gave a strike notice, the copy of which is Ex. R-17. It is further stated that the Conciliation Officer had written a letter to the workmen on 18-7-1985. the copy of which is Ex. R-18 and told the workmen not to proceed on strike but all these efforts failed and on 22-7-1985 the loyal workmen were not permitted by the petitioners to enter the factory. Some of the workmen had not joined the strike and they wanted to attend their duties but they were kept back by the strikers including the claimants in these proceedings. He has also stated that the domestic enquiry was held against Shri Narain Dass and Roshan Lal Kapoor and the enquiry report is Ex. R-19. On its basis, the services of both these workmen were terminated on 22-10-1985. He has also stated that the services of Shri S. C. Chaudhary and Sheesh Pal were also terminated *vide* order Ex. R-20. According to Shri Modgil, Shri Mast Ram Sushil had tried to drag the Driver from the Van of the Factory at the Gate of the Factory.

This witness has been cross-examined, but nothing helpful to the claimant workman has been brought out.

Shri I. D. Sharma RW-2 has corroborated the statement of Shri Modgil RW-1. In all the material particulars, he has stated that the respondent had received supply order from the Defence Forces and that this was a time bound order and he had instructed the workmen to increase the production and had also told them that they will getemoluments at enhanced rates but the workmen adopted' 'go slow attitude' as a result of which the production fall. He has also stated that barring twelve workmen, all other went on strike and that this illegal strike was the result of the instigation by S/Shri Narain Dass , Roshan Lal Kapoor, S. C. Chaudhary, Sheesh Pal and Mast Ram Sushil.

He has also given the details of the violent incident, which took place on 24-7-1985. He has stated that when the van reached the gate of the factory, the striking workmen had assembled at the gate of the Factory and they did not permit the Van carrying the Supervisory Staff and the workmen to enter the Factory premises and that Shri Mast Ram Sushil tried to pull out the Driver of the Bus from his seat. When all this was happening, this witness proceeds to state that he went to the gate of the Factory and persuaded striking workers not to stop the bus and that the bus was driven inside the Factory with the help of the Security Guards. In the meantime, Shri Mast Ram Sushil, claimant came running and shouted at him and grappled with him. The Security Guards intervened and he was rescued. He has furhter stated that he informed the managing Director about what had happened on 24-7-1985 and thereafter the Managing Director dismissed Shri Mast Ram Sushil. According to him, this illegal strike commenced from 22-7-1985 and continued upto 31-10-1985, although, it had been prohibited by the notification issued by the Government of Himachal Pradesh on 7-10-1985 (Ex.-R-24). This witness has been cross-examined at length, but nothing favourable has been brought out from him by the workmen.

Shri Chatter Singh, RW-3 is the Driver of the Bus. He has given the details of what had happened at the Gate of the Factory. He has corroborated the statement of Shri I. D. Sharma, RW-2 and has stated that Shri Mast Ram Sushil had assulted him and tried to pull him out of the Bus. This witness was also cross-examined but nothing favourable has been brought from him by the workmen.

In rebuttal, the workmen have led evidence, Shri Suresh Kumar, PW 1 is one of the workmen. He has stated that the demand notice Ex. P-1 to Ex. P-3 had been served on the respondent management but to no useful result and, therefore, the workmen had gone on strike. He has further stated that the Government had declared the strike illegal on 7th October, 1985. He has also stated that the respondent management called all the workmen and told them that they should not go on strike. Inspite of this, workmen did not join their duties. He has also stated that the services of 5 claimant workmen have been terminated and that the other workmen had also come to know about it and that they have also come to know that the reference of the termination of services, has been

made to the Labour Court, but inspite of that, they did not call off the strike, Shri Uttam Singh, PW-2 has stated that he had also joined the strike on 22-7-1985 and that all the workmen in fact were on strike. He has also stated that the letters had also been exchanged between the respondent management and their union, the copies of which are Ex. P-4 to Ex. P-9. Shri Narain, PW-3, is one of the workmen, whose services have been terminated. He has stated that the Demand Notice was served on the respondent management on 13-5-1985 and that the copy of the notice is Ex. P-2, but their demands were not considered and the matter was referred to the Conciliation Officer, but nothing come out from the Conciliation Proceedings as well. He has further stated that another demand notice was served on 14-5-1985 and workers went on strike on 15/16-5-1985, and that this was a tool down strike. He has further stated that the Conciliation Officer called a meeting on 17-5-1985 where the respondent and the representatives of the Union participated. According to him, the suspension and the termination of the services was vindictive.

Sheesh Pal, PW-4 is another workmen, whose services have been terminated. He has stated that he is not guilty of any misconduct nor he has instigated any follow workmen to go on strike or to continue the same.

From the evidence discussed above, it appears that there were settlements between the workmen and the respondent management. Those settlements are Ex. R-1 and Ex. R-2. Both these settlements have not been terminated as required under section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. No notice of termination of the settlements have been served on the respondent management. The Authorised Representative of the workmen has tried to argue that the notice of demand Ex. of P-1 to Ex. P-3 and the correspondence entered into by the parties will be sufficient notice of the termination of settlement. I find no force in these arguments. No inference of termination of settlement can be gathered from the notices Ex. P-1 to Ex. P-3 and the reply of the respondent. There is absolutely no letter or letters from the workmen addressed to the respondent management indicating the intention to terminate the settlement. Reference in this regard may be made to "Cochin State Power, Light Corporation Ltd. v/s its workmen (1954) II L.L. 3,100 (Supreme Court); Workmen of Eastern India Match Co. v/s. Western India Match Co. (1962) I; L.L. 3,661 (Supreme Court) : Banglore Woollen, Cotton and Silk Mills Co. Ltd., v/s. thair workmen (1968) I L. L. 3, 555 (Supreme Court). This argument of the Authorised representative of the workmen is without force.

The Authorised Representative of the workmen has further argued that on the basis of the notice of demands served by the workmen, Conciliation proceedings had taken place and, therefore, this conduct of the parties may be found sufficient to inform that the settlements were terminated. I am afraid, the mere participation in the Conciliation proceedings after the notices of demands were served on the respondent management, cannot be considered to be a notice terminating the settlements in accordance with the provisions of Section 19 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. From these considerations, it is clear that the strike in the life-time of the settlements without its being terminated is illegal. The petitioners are also guilty of misconduct. They were the office bearers of the union and had openly instigated the other workmen to go on strike. It was a misconduct on their part.

Moreover, the strike was not peaceful at all. The workmen under the guidence and leadership of the petitioners had blocked the gate of the Factory premises and stopped the vehicle taking the loyal workmen and other staff to enter the premises of the Factory. Shri Mast Ram Sushil had gone to the extent of manhandling the Driver of the Bus by trying to pull him out of the Driving seat, when the vehicle was in motion. If he had succeeded in pulling out the Driver, anything could happen to the occupants of the bus. Not only that when the Assistant Managers, Shri I. D. Sharma, tried to intervene, Shri Mast Ram Sushil assaulted him. Petitioners and other striking workmen were privy to all this.

Again, this strike had been prohibited by the State Government *vide* Ex. R-24, dated 7-10-1985 in accordance with the provisions of Section 10(3) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, but the striking workmen continued this strike and did not withdraw nor they reported for duties. They have actually joined their duties on 1-11-1985. After the issue of the notification, Ex. R-24, dated 7-10-1985, the strike was illegal. This strike illegally commenced *w.e.f.* 22-7-1985 and was illegally continuing till it was withdrawn and the striking workmen reported for duty on 1-11-1985. To conclude, all the petitioners are guilty of grave misconduct of commencing and continuing illegal strike. They have instigated their fallow workmen to join this illegal strike. They were the office bearers of the worker's Union and have failed to rise to the occasion and keep themselves and their followers under discipline. Even the manager Shri I. D. Sharma was assaulted and Chatter Singh driver was tried to be pulled out of the driveer's seat from a running vehicle full of passangers. All the petitioners are guilty of indiscipline and have broken the industrial peace without any cause or otherwise. It is settled law that discipline is the very basis of well organised and enlightened society. In common language, it cannotes a system of rules of conduct or mode of life in accordance with rules. In industrial management disciplinary action is thus called for in cases of misconduct. For determining the punishment of dismissal, the case of illegal strikes have to be divided into two classes:—

(*i*) where standing orders and rules provides for punishment of dismissal for resorting to illegal strikes and

(*ii*) where standing orders are silent on the matter.

Where the strike declared by the workmen is an illegal strike, the striking workers are liable to dismissed if the standing orders exercisely provide for punishment. In cases there is no express provision of dismissal for illegal strike, the extreme punishment of dismissal is not justified for more participation in an illegal strike, particularly when striking workmen have remained peaceful and non-violent. But punishment of dismissal is proper for misconduct such as, formenting or inciting an illegal strike or violent activities during strike or thereto to loyal workers. (Model Mills Ltd. v/s Dharamdas AIR 1959 S.C. 311: Punjab National Bank v/s Workmen AIR 1966 S. C. 160; I M M Press v/s 1.1 Delhi AIR 1951 S.C. 1168).

Now taking into consideration the facts and the circumstances of this case, I find that the punishment of the termination of the services of the petitioners is a proper punishment. There is absolutely no scope for hearing a different view. Both these issues are accordingly decided in favour of the respondent and against the petitioners.

RELIEF

In view of the aforesaid considerations and dicisions on the issues, the reference is answered accordingly. I find, hold and award that the termination of the Services of the petitioner workmen cannot be set aside and quashed as the same is valid. I further hold that the strike was illegal from beginning to the end. Let this award be published in the Rajpatra in accordance with the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The parties are left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The copy of this award be supplied to the parties, if applied for, free of costs.

Dated : 26-7-1987.

S. S. KANWAR,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court.

Before Shri S. S. Kanwar, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh. Shimla

Case No. 517/85

General Secretary, Concrete Poles and Paper Conversion Unit, Parwanoo .. *Petitioner.*

Versus

Managing Director, Himachal Pradesh, State Small Industries and Export Corporation, Shimla .. *Respondent.*

Shri Dhani Ram, Authorised Representative of the petitioners.
Shri P. C. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

The following questions have been referred to this court *vide* Notification, dated 4-8-1984 :-

(1) Whether the demand of the workers who have completed 240 days of continuous service for being made regular is justified or not .

(2) Whether the demand of the two pairs of shopes and Uniforms to the workers is legal. If not, the quantum of relief pay, they are entitled to?

(3) Whether the demand for the construction of shed for the workers is justified. If not, the relief, if any, they are entitled ?

The claim petition has been filed by the petitioners. In this claim petition, the workmen have only perferred their claim/demand with respect to the treatment of the workmen as regular who have completed 240 days of continuous service. Their pleas about the remaining two pleas No. 2 & 3 are half hearted. The authorised representative of the petitioner states that these demands have been settled by the respondent management and they are satisfied and for the present, they do not press these demands.

The respondent management in its reply has stated that the workmen employed by the respondent are working in a factory registered under the Factories Act, 1948 and their conditions of service are similar to those employees who are working in a factory. It is also admitted that the respondent factory is governed by the Factories Act, 1948. In view of this reply, there is no serious contest with respect to demand No. 1 also. However, from the averments of the parties, the following issues arose and were framed on 23-2-1986:—

(1) Whether the demand of the workmen who have completed 240 days of continuous service for being made regular is justified or not ?

(2) Whether the demands of the workmen for the supply of two pairs of shoes and uniforms is legal. If not, the quantum of relief claimed, they are entitled to ?

(3) Whether the demand of the workmen for the construction of shed is justified. If not, the relief, if any, they are entitled ?

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1:

In accordance with the averments of the Parties relating to this issue, no evidence is required to be led. Under the provision of section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, a workman, who has put in 240 days of continuous service in a year, cannot be retrenchedand he is to be treated for all purposes under the Industrial Disputes Act, and for the purpose of all other Acts governing the condition of service, rights and duties under the various labour laws as a regular workman. Such a workman is entitled to some benefits and protection under the Industrial Disputes Act and various other Acts. The authorised representative of the respondent contends that simply because a workman is a regular, is not entitled to any enhanced wages or wages in scales. Such a workman is only entitled to protection aforded to him under the Industrial Disputed Act and other enactments. I see no difficulty in accepting this contention. As the same time, the result would be that a workman who has put in 240 days of continuous service, would be deeemed to be a regular workman and entitled to protection under the labour laws. I decide this issue accordingly.

Issue No. 2 and 3:

Both these issues have not been pressed for. These are, therefore, decided accordingly against the petitioners.

RELIEF

In the result, it is declared that a workman, who has put in more than 240 days, continuous service in a year, will be deemed to be a regular workman and entitled to all the protections in accordance with various labour laws. No order as to cost of these proceedings. Let this award be published.

Announced

13-9-1987.

S. S. KANWAR,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, H. P.

शिमला-171002, 1 दिसम्बर, 1987

संख्या 14-11/87-एल0ई0पी0.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमालय फर्टिलाईजरर्ज लिमिटिड वर्कज युनियन मझोली, तहसील नालागढ़, जिला सोलन तथा मै0 हिमालय फर्टिलाईजरज लि0 मझौली तहसील नालागढ़, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है :

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अन्तर्गत समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश सुनिश्चित है कि यह मामला श्रम अधिकरण को भेज देने योग्य है :

अत: औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 का अधिनियम संख्या (14) की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश एतद्द्वारा इस मामले को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 7 के अन्तर्गत निर्मित श्रम अधिकरण को नीचे व्याख्या किये गए विषय पर अपना निर्णय देने के लिये भेजते हैं :

"Whether the claim of the Union to regularise the 12 daily wage workers (list enclosed) of the Himalaya Fertilizers Manjholi, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan is permissible. If yes, what relief and amount of compensation the workman are entitled to"

PARTICULARS OF DAILY WAGES WORKERS EMPLOYED IN HIMALAYA FERTILIZERS LIMITED, MANJHOLI

Sr. No	Name of the workers	Date of Appointment	wages per day
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Parkash Chand Sharma (Elect. Deptt.)	7.11.1975	16/-+25/- S.P.
2.	Shri Hazara Ram (Elect. Deptt)	9-8-75	16/-+25/-SP
3.	Shri Amar Dass (Plant Sec.)	12-8-1976	14.75
4.	Shri Krishan Singh -do-	4-8-1976	16/-
5.	Shri Sarwan Singh -do-	31-8-1976	14.75
6.	Shri Harinder Chaudhary -do-	1-9-1976	14.75
7.	Shri Ram Dass -do-	1-9-1976	14.75
8.	Shri Dayal Singh (Security)	13-9-1976	14.75
9.	Smt. Binta Devi (Admn)	16-8-1979	13.00
10.	Shri Maha Singh (Plant)	8-10-1979	14.75
11.	Shri Gurdev Singh -do-	26-8-1980	14.75
12.	Shri Narpat Ram	17-9-1982	16.00

शिमला–171002, 2 दिसम्बर, 1987

संख्या 14–24/87 श्रम.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री नवीन चन्द्र तथा मै0 कमला डायल एण्ड डिवायसस (लि0) परवाणु, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है।

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अन्तर्गत समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश सुनिश्चित है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को भेज देने योग्य है।

अतः औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 का अधिनियम संख्या (14) की धारा 12 की उप धारा (5) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश एतद्द्वारा इस मामले को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 7 के अन्तर्गत निर्मित श्रम न्यायालय को नीचे व्याख्या किये गए विषय पर अपना निर्णय देने के लिये भेजते हैं :

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Naveen Chander by the management of M/s Kamla Dials and Devices Ltd. Parwanoo, District Solan is permissible. If not, to what relief and amount of compensation Shri Naveen Chander is entitled"

शिमला–171002, 2 दिसम्बर, 1987

संख्या 14-25/87-श्रम.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री राजिन्द्र कुमार तथा ए0 बी0 एल0 कैपेसीटरज प्रा0 (लि0) चम्बाघाट जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है :

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अन्तर्गत समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश सुनिश्चित है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को भेज देने योग्य है :

अतः औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की अधिनियम संख्या (14) की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुये राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश एतद्द्वारा इस मामले को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 की धारा 7 के अन्तर्गत निर्मित श्रम न्यायालय को नीचे व्याख्या किये गए विषय पर अपना निर्णय देने के लिये भेजते हैं :

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Rajinder Kumar by the management of ABL Capacitors (Pvt.) Ltd. Electronic complex Chambaghat is permissible. If not, to what relief and amount of compensation Shri Rajinder Kumar is entitled"

आदेशानुसार,
हस्ताक्षरित/-
सचिव (श्रम)।

लोक निर्माण विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 11 दिसम्बर, 1987

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) 7(1)80/87.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव झिकली अम्बाड़ी पानखर, मलां अम्बाड़ी तथा मलां खास, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा में मलां अम्बाड़ी मुहालकड़ कवाड़ी सड़क के निर्माण के लिए भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सभी सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों के लिए यह घोषणा की जाती है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, कांगड़ा को उक्त भूमि को अर्जन करने के लिए आदेश लेने का एतद्द्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक भूमि अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, कांगड़ा के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[*Authoritative English text of this Government notification No. Lok Nirman (Kha) 7(1)80/87, dated 11-12-87 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India*].

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, *the 11th December*, 1987

No. PBW (B&R)-(B)7(1) 80/87.—Whereas it appears to the Governor, Himachal Pradesh that the land is required to be taken by the Government of Himachal Pradesh at the public expense for a public purpose, namely Mlan-Ambari-Muhalkar-Kwari road in Village Jhikli Ambari, Pankhar, Mlan Ambari and Mlan Khas, Tehsil and District Kangra, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

2. The declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern and under the provision of section 7 of the said Act, the Collector, Land Acquisition, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh Public Works Department is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the land may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Land Acquisition, H. P. P.W.D., Kangra.

विवरणी

SPECIFICATION

जिला : कांगड़ा — *District:* KANGRA
तहसील : कांगड़ा — *Tehsil:* KANGRA

गांव Village 1	खसरा नं0 Khasra No. 2	क्षेत्र Area हैक्टेयर में Hectare 3		
झिकली अम्बाड़ी JHIKLI AMBARI	903/1	0	01	36
	905/1	0	03	78
	917/1	0	02	28
Total Kitta ..	3	1	07	42
पानखर PANKHAR	322/302/3/2	0	01	53
मलां अम्बाड़ी MLAN AMBARI	1	0	03	61
मलां खास MLAN KHAS	736/1	0	01	75
कुल योग .. Total kitta ..		0	14	31

By order,
Sd/-
Secretary.

भाग 2—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

शून्य

भाग 3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाइनेन्शियल कमिश्नर तथा कमिश्नर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि

शिक्षा विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 5 नवम्बर, 1986

संख्या ज0 (8) 8/86-शिक्षा-क-.—यत: हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामत: गांव फाटी, अरसू, कोठी ढोल तहसील निरमण्ड, जिला कुल्लू में सरकारी हाई स्कूल अरसु के लिए स्कूल भवन तथा खेल के मैदान बनाने हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है । अतएव एतद्द्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है ।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को जो इससे सम्बन्धित हैं या हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है ।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके को किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं ।

4. कोई भी ऐसा हितबद्ध व्यक्ति, जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन करने पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के 30 दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, आनी के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है ।

विस्तृत विवरण

जिला : कुल्लू तहसील: निरमण्ड

गांव/कस्बा 1	खसरा नं0 2	एरिया बी0 3	वि0 4	विस्वां0 5
फाटी: अरसू, कोठी: ढोल	1481/415	1	0	0
किता . .	1	1	0	0

[*Authoritative English Text of this Department's Notification No. JA(8)-8/86-Shiksha-KA, dated* 5-11-86 *as required under clause* (3) *of Article* 348 *of the constitution of India*].

Shimla-171 002, *the 5th November*, 1986

No. JA(8)8/86-Shiksha-KA.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Himachal Pradesh that the land is likely to be required to be taken by the Himachal Pradesh Government at the public expenses, for public purpose, namely for the construction of school building and play-ground in village Phati, Arsu, Kothi Dhol, Tehsil Nirmand, District Kullu, for Government High School Arsu, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be acquired for the said purpose.

2. This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

4. Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of the said land in the locality may, within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Ani.

SPECIFICATION

District: KULLU *Tehsil:* NIRMAND

Village/Town 1	Khasra No. 2	Area Big. 3	Bis. 4	Bisw. 5
PHATI, ARSU, KOTHI: DHOL	1481/415	1	0	0
Kitta ..	2	1	0	0

शुद्धि पत्र

शिमला-171 002, 22 जनवरी, 1987

संख्या ज (8)-8/86-शिक्षा-क.—कृपया इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या ज (8)-8/86-I शिक्षा-क, दिनांक 5-11-86 के पैरा 4 में शब्द "कुल्लू" के स्थान पर कोष्ठ शब्द और चिह्न, "उप-मण्डल अधिकारी (नागरिक) आनी, जिला कुल्लू" पढ़ा जाए ।

[*Authorised English Text of this Department Notification No. Ja* (8) 8/86- *Shiksha-Ka. dated* 22-1-87 *as required under clause* (3) *of Article* 348 *of the Constitution of India.*]

CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-171002, *the 22nd January*, 1987

No. Ja (8)8/86-Shiksha-Ka.—Please *read* for the word "Kullu" the bracket, word and sign, "Sub-Divisional Officer) (Civil) Anni, District Kullu" in para 4 of the authorised English text of this Department Notification number Ja (8) 8/86-Shiksha-Ka, dated 5-11-1986.

By order,
M. K. KAW,
Financial Commissioner (Education).

भाग 4—स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन: म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

शून्य

भाग 5—वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

In the Court of Shri D. P. Sood, District Judge, Kangra at Dharmshala (Himachal Pradesh)

In Re: Succession Act case No. 7 of 1987

Smt. Santosh Kumari daughter of Shri Bishamber Dass, Talwar, House No. 264, Mohalla Mast Garh, Jammu (J&K) ..Petitioner.

Versus

Shri Hans Raj and another ..Respondents.

Versus:—The general public ..(Respondent No. 2)

Whereas the above named petitioner has filed an application in this court for the grant of Succession Certificate under section 372 of the Indian Succession Act in the matter of assets of Late Shri Bishamber Dass son of (not mentioned), resident of Brigade Bazar, Yol Camp, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra who died on 25-10-1968 at village Brigade Bazar, Yol Camp, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the General Public of the Illaqua and the kith and kins of the deceased Shri Bishamber Dass to attend this court on March 7, 1988 at 10 A.M. personally or through pleader or any authorised agent to file objections, if any, to the grant of such certificate to the petitioner failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this 16th day of December, 1987.

Seal. D. P. SOOD,
District Judge,
Kangra at Dharamshala.

In the Court of Smt. Kiran Agarwal Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh

In the matter of:—

Smt. Dhebli wd/o Kamla r/o Village Arda, Illaqua Rehardhar, Tehsil Sadar, District Mandi natural Guardian of Shri Narpat minor being her mother .. *Petitioner.*

Versus

General public .. *Respondent.*

Petition under section 8 of Hindu Minority and Guardian Ship Act.

Notice to:—

General public.

Whereas in the above noted petition the petitioner Smt. Dhebli has applied for the permission to sell the land comprised in Khata Khatauni No. 6 min Khasra No. 706 measuring 9-0-19 bighas situated n Mauja Tahela Shakor, Tehsil Sadar Mandi.

Hence the notice is hereby given to the General Public relatives and other interested persons that if any body has got any objection to grant the permission to sell the land owned by the aforesaid petitioners be filed in the court on or before 11-1-1988 at 10 A.M. at Mandi failing which the petitioner shall be heard and decided *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of the court this 15th day of December, 1987.

KIRAN AGARWAL,
Seal. *Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi.*

In the Court of Smt. Kiran Agarwal, Senior Sub Judge, Mandi

Succession Application No.

Date of Hearing 11-1-1988

Dinesh Kumar, 2. Devinder Kumar, 3. Mst. Shammi Sons and daughter respectively of late Shri Ratan Chand r/o Lower Samkhetar Mandi Town *Petitioner.*

Versus

General public *Respondent.*

Applicaton u/s 372 of Indian Succession Act.

Application u/s 372 of Indian Succession Act.

To

The general public.

Whereas in the above noted case the above named applicants have filed an application in this court under section 372 of the Indian succession Act in respect of the assets of Late Smt. Kamla Devi r/o Lower Samkhetar Mandi Town.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the above named respondent of the Illaqua and the kith and kins of the deceased to file objection if any, to the grant of such Succession Certificate in this court on 11-1-88 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent/ pleader failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Seal. KIRAN AGARWAL,
Senior Sub-Judge Mandi.

In the Court of Smt. Kiran Agarwal, Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi

Succession Application No. 35/1987

Date of Hearing 15-1-1987

1. Smt. Jogoshwaru wd/o Balak Ram, 2. Pritam Singh, 3. Chet Ram sons of, 4. Uma Devi, 5. Rabi Devi daughters of, 6. Kumari Bhishma minor d/o,7. Hem Singh minors s/o Balak Ram all resident of village Jahal Illaqa Dhangiara, Tehsil Chachiot, DistrictMandi *Petitioners.*

Versus

General public .. *Respondent.*

Application u/s 372 of Indian Succession Act.

To

The general public.

Whereas in the above noted case the above named applicants have filed an application in this court under section 372 of the Indian succession Act in respect of the assets of Late Shri Balak Ram s/o Mangtu Ram r/o Jahal Illaqua Dhangiara, Tehsil Chachiot, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the above named respondent of the Illaqua and the kith and kins of the deceased to file objection if any, to the grant of such succession certificate in this court on 15-1-1988 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent/ pleader failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Seal. KIRAN AGARWAL,
Senior Sub-Judge Mandi.

In the Court of Smt. Kiran Agarwal, Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi

Succession Application No. 39 of 1987

Date of Hearing 30-1-1988

1. Smt. Sarla Devi wd/o Sohan Singh, 2. Smt. Krishna Devi w/o Upender Singh, 3. Tek Singh, 4. Devinder Singh, pachhitt residents of village Janed P. O. Marathu, Illaqa Tehsil Sadar District Mandi .. *Petitioners.*

Versus

General public .. *Respondent.*

Application u/s 372 of Indian Succession Act.

To

The general public.

Whereas in the above noted case the above named applicants have filed an application in this court under section 372 of the Indian Succession Act in respect of the assets of Late Shri Sohan Singh s/o Partap Singh who died on 3-2-1987.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the above named respondent of the Illaqa and the kith and kins of the deceased to file objection if any, to the grant of such succession Certificate in this court on 30-1-1988 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent/pleader failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Seal.

KIRAN AGARWAL,
Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi.

In the Court of Smt. Kiran Agarwal, Senior Sub-Judge, Mandi

Succession Application No. 32/87

Date of Hearing 27-1-1988

Lekh Raj s/o Shyam Lal r/o Approach Road, P.O. Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh .. *Petitioner.*

Versus

General public .. *Respondent.*

Application for the grant of succession Certificate.

Application u/s 372 of Indian Succession Act.

To

The general public.

Whereas in the above noted case the above named applicants have filed an application in this court under section 372 of the Indian Succession Act in respect of the assts of Late Shri Amar Nath s/o Shyam Lal r/o Approach Road Jogindernagar. District Mandi.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the above named respondent of the Illaqua and the kith and kins of the deceased to file objection if any, to he grant of such Succession Certificate in this court on 27-1-1988 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent/pleader failing which the petition will be heard and disposed of *ex-parte*.

Seal.

KIRAN AGARWAL,
Senior Sub-Judge Mandi.

IN THE COURT OF SMT. KIRAN AGARWAL, SENIOR SUB-JUDGE, MANDI (H.P.)

In the matter of :—

Smt. Karam Bibi wd/o Najeer Mohamad, r/o Sarkaghat, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi (H.P.) .. Applicant.

Versus

General public .. Respondent.

Application under section 8 of Minority and Guardianship Act, for permission to sell the land of minor.

Notice to:—

General public.

Whereas in the above noted petition the petitioner Smt. Karam Bibi has applied for the permission to sell the land measuring 0-0-27 hectares Khata No. 201/454 Khasra No. 419/420 Kita 2 Measuring 0-0-54 hectares situated in village Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P.

Hence the notice is hereby given to the general public relatives and other interested persons that if any body has got any objection to grant the permission to sell the land owned by the aforesaid petitioners be filed in the Court on or before 15-1-1988 at 10 A.M. at Mandi failing which the petitioner shall be heard and decided *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court this 15th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

KIRAN AGARWAL,
Senior Sub-Judge,
Mandi.

In the Court of Shri A.C. Thalwal Sub-Judge Ist Class Amb, District Una, Himachal Pradesh

Civil Suit No. 86/1986

1. Joginder Singh 2. Beer Singh *alias* Raghubir Singh sons of Basati Ram S/o Noranga, 3. Smt. Kamla Devi, daughter of Basati Ram son of Noranga, r/o Village Athman, Tahsil Amb, District Una, .. *Plaintiffs.*

Versus

Amin Chand s/o Gokal s/o Ram Dhan, residant of Village Athman, Tehsil Amb, District Una (H.P.) .. *Defendant.*

Suit for declaration

Whereas in the above noted case, it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above named defendant Shri Amin Chand s/o Gokal s/o Ram Dhan, can not be served in the ordinary course of service as summons issued several times in their name have come back unserved. Hence this proclamation under order 5 Rule 20, C.P.C. is hereby issued against him requiring the above name defendant Shri Amin Chand to appear in this Court on 16-1-1988 at 10.00 a.m. personally or through an authorised agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which an *ex parte* proceedings shall be taken against him.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court today the 24 day of November, 1987.

Seal.

A. C. THALWAL
Sub Judge 1st Class,
Amb, District Una, H.P.

In the Court of Shri M.K. Bansal, Sub-Judge (I), Dharamshala Himachal Pradesh

Civil Suit No. 142/1987

Manohar Lal *Vs.* Ramesh Kumar etc.

To

Shri Sain Dass son of Sunder Dass resident of Guggal Tehsil & District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.. *Defendant.*

Whereas in the above noted civil suit it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above named defendant is evading the service of the summons and cannot be served in the normal course of the service. Hence this proclamation under 5 Rule 20 C.P.C. is hereby issued against him to appear in this court on 16-1-1988 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against him.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this 14th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

M.K. BANSAL,
Sub-Judge (I) Dharamshala.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI PRITAM SINGH, JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE 1ST CLASS, JOGINDERNAGAR, DISTRICT MANDI, (H. P.)

In the matter of:—

Criminal Misc. Case No. 68-III/87

Mul Chand s/o Shri Tolu Ram, r/o village Dhanwan, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, H.P. ..Applicant.

Versus

General public. ..Respondent.

Application u/s 10(3) of Registration of Birth and Death Act.

To

The general public.

Whereas the above noted applicant has moved an application in this Court praying that due to inadvertance he could not get the date of birth of his daughter Raj Kumari entered in the register of Gram Panchayat. Date of birth of his daughter Raj Kumari is 27-7-1982.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public, kith and kins to file their objections if any before this Court on or before 16-1-1988 at 10.00 a.m. either personaly or through authorised agent failing which the application shall be heard and allowed in favour of the applicant.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court today the 7th day of December, 1987.

PRITAM SINGH,
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Jogindernagar, District Mandi,

Seal.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI PRITAM SINGH, JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE 1ST CLASS, JOGINDERNAGAR, DISTRICT MANDI, (H.P.)

In the matter of:—

Cr. Misc. Petition No. 67-III/87

Shri Chanda Ram s/o Shri Lohar, r/o Village Graman, Tehsil Jogindernagar. District Mandi (H.P.) ..Applicant.

Versus

General public ..Respondent.

Application u/s 10(3) of registration of Birth and Death Act.

To

The General public.

Whereas the above noted applicant has moved an application in this Court praying that due to inadvertance he could not get the date of birth of his son Man Singh entered in the register of Gram Panchayat. Date of birth of his son (Man Singh) is 22-3-1982.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public and kith and kins to file their objections if any before this Court on or before 16-1-1988 at 10.00 a.m. either personally or through authorised agent, failing which the application shall be heard and allowed in favour of the applicant

Given under my hand and seal of the Court today the 7th day of December, 1987.

PRITAM SINGH,
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Jogindernagar, District Mandi,

Seal.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI PRITAM SINGH, JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE 1ST CLASS, JOGINDERNAGAR, DISTRICT MANDI, (H.P.)

In the matter of:—

Cr. Misc. Petition No. 69-III/87

Smt. Ratti Devi wd/o Shri Daulat Ram, r/o Village Tikkar, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, (H.P.) ..Applicant

Versus

General public ..Respondent.

Application u/s 13(3) of Registration of Birth and Death Act, 1969.

To

The general public.

Whereas the above noted applicant has moved an application in this Court praying that due to inadvertance she could not get the date of birth of her son Raju entered in the register of Gram Panchayat Sudhar, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, Date of birth of her above named son is 6-10-1981.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public and kith and kins to file their objections if any before this Court on or before 16-1-1988 at 10.00 a.m. either personally or through authorised agent, failing which the applicat on shall be heard and allowed in favour of the applicant.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court today the 7th day of December, 1987.

PRITAM SINGH,
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Jogindernagar, District Mandi,

Seal.

In the Court of Shri Pritam Singh, Judicial Magistrate 1s Class, Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh

In the matter of:—

Cr. Misc. Case No. 191-III/87

Shri Jatroo s/o Shri Himtoo, resident of village Bulang, Illaqua Hastpur, Tehsi Jogindernagar. .. *Applicant.*

Versus

The general public.

Application u/s 13(3) of registration of Birth and Death Act, 1969.

To

The general public.

Whereas the above noted applicant has moved an application in this court praying that due to inadvertance he could not get the date of birth entered in the register of Gram Panchayat Sudhar of his following sons:—

Name of son:	Date of birth
Nanak Chand ..	23-6-1972.
Maghu ..	14-1-1977.
Chamaru ..	1-11-1980.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public and kith and kins to file their objections, if any before this court on or before 15-1-1988 at 10.00 A.M. either personally or through authorised agent, failing which the application shall be heard and allowed in favour of the applicant.

Given under my hand and Seal of the court today the 9th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

PRITAM SINGH,
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Jogindernagar, District Mandi, H. P.

In the Court of Shri Pritam Singh, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh

In the matter of:—

Cr. Misc. Case No. 192-III/87

Shri Poshu s/o Shri Khima Ram, resident of Village Bulang, Illaqua Hastpur, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh .. *Applicant.*

Versus

The general public .. *Respondent.*

Application U.S.13(3) of Registration of Birth and Death Act, 1969.

To

The general public.

Whereas the above noted applicant has moved an application in this court praying that due to inadvertance he could not get the date of birth of his son Jogi Ram and Daughter Chamari (twin) both born on 23-11-1985 entered in the register of Gram Panchayat Sudhar.

Hence this proclamation is hereby issued to the general public and kith and kins to file their objections, if any before this court on or before 15-1-1988 at 10.00 a.m., either personally or through authorised agent, failing which the application shall be heard and allowed in favour of the applicant.

Given under my hand and seal of the court today the 9th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

PRITAM SINGH,
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Jogindernagar, District Mandi, H.P.

In the Court of Shri C. L. Kochhar. Sub-Judge Ist Class, Palampur (II)

Civil Suit No. 191/86

Next date of hearing : 13-1-1988

State Bank of India a corporation constituted under the State Bank of India, Act, 1955 (Act No. XXIII of 1955) having one of its Branches at Jaisinghpur and Functioning as S.B. I. Jaisinghpur,

District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, through its Branch Manager, Shri Krishan Singh .. *Plaintiff.*

Versus

Shri Kalyan Chand son of Shri Munshi Ram, resident of Village Sanghole, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.

Suit for the recovery of Rs. 799.79

Whereas in above noted case, it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the defnedant named above cannot be served in ordinary way. You are hereby directed by this notice under section 5 Rule 20, C.P.C. to appear in this court on 13-1-88 at 10 a.m. the next date of hearing in this case, personally or through your counsel and conduct the same failing which an *ex parte* proceedings shall be taken against you.

Given under my hand and seal of this court today this 9th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

C. L. KOCHHAR
Sub-Judge 1st Calss,
Palampur.

In the Court of Shri C. L. Kochhar, Sub Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Palampur (II)

Civil Suit No. 241/86

Next date of hearing : 20-2-1988

Onkar Nath etc. *Versus* Smt. Kanta Devi and others.

Versus—

3. Sh. Sucha Ram son of Sh. Sidhu resident of Bhawarna , Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, H. P. 4. Sh. Hem Raj s/o Shri Rala Ram resident of Paprola , Tehsil Baijnath , District Kangra, H.P. 5. Smt. Bimla Devi wd/o Sh. Dulo Ram, 6. Sudesh Kumar, 7. Sandip Kumar sons of Sh. Dulo Ram, 8. Usha Devi, 9. Asha Devi, 10. Surekha Devi, 11. Miridula Devi, 12. Abhilasha Devi, 13. Toshi Kanta daughters of Sh. Ram Chand , 14. Yugal Kishore, 15· Tarlok Chand sons of Sh. Jagat Ram 16. Kamni Devi, 17 Sushma Devi ds/o Sh. Jagat Ram 18. Bhandari, 19. Arbind, 20. Ashwani, 21. Rajnish sons of Shri Hari Ram, 22. Babli, 23. Bimla Devi ds/o Sh. Hari Ram, 24. Sunil, 25. Anil, 26. Sudhir, 27. Pardeep sons of Shri Jagdish Chand, 28. Smt. Amro Devi wd/o Sh. Jagdish Chand, 29. Kanan Wala, 30. Rani, 31. Ranu ds/o Sh. Jagdish Chand . 32. Dalip Kumar, 33. Pardeep Kumar sons of Sh. Pancham Chand, 34. Meenakshi Devi d/o Shri Pancham Chand, 35. Karam Chand s/o Shri Moti Ram, 36. Sarad Chand s/o Smt. Narotmi all are residents of Bhawarna, Tehsil Palampur District Kangra, H. P. .. *Proforma Defendants.*

Wherea in the above-noted case, it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the Proforma defendants named above are not be served in ordinary way. They are hereby directed by this court notice under section 5, rule 20, C.P.C. to appear in this court on 20-2-1988 at 10 a.m. the next date of hearing in this case, personally or through your counsel and conduct the same failing which an *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against them.

Given under my hand and the seal of this court today this 9th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

C. L. KOCHHAR,
Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Palampur (II).

In the Court of Sub-Judge, Nahan District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh

State Bank of India a body corporate constituted under the State Bank of India Act, 1955 through its Branch Manager Shri D.L. Gupta, State Bank of India, Nahah District Sirmaur Himachal Pradesh. .. *Plaintiff*

Versus

Shri Vijay Kumar s/o Shri Kacha Ram, Village Mohalla Ram Kundi, Nahan District Sirmaur Himachal Pradesh .. *Defendant.*

Suit for recovery of Rs. 1,840.09

To

Shri Vijay Kumar s/o Shri Kacha Ram, Village Mohalla Ram Kundi, Nahan.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above named defendant is evading the service of the summon and cannot be served in the noral course of service. Hence this proclamation under order 5, rule 20, C.P.C. is hereby issued against to appear in this court on or before 5-1-88 at 10 A.M. personally through an authorised agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which *ex-parte* proceeding will be taken against them.

Given under my hand and seal of the court this 1st day of December, 1987.

Seal.

JAI NARAYAN,
Sub-Judge, Nahan,
District Sirmaur.

In the Court of Sub Judge Ist Class, Nalagarh, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh

In re: Case No. 72/1 of 87.

Smt. Piar Kaur .. *Plaintiff.*

Versus

Shri Gurdit Singh .. *Defendants.*

Suit for declaration

To

Shri Gurdit Singh s/o Ishar Singh son of Kartar Singh, r/o Village Chandpur, Pr. and Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh.

Whereas in the above noted case, it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above noted defendant can not be served through ordinary course of the process. As summon is issued to him, received back un-served, hence he is evading the service of the summons. Hence, this proclamation under Order 5, Rule 20 C.P.C. is hereby issued to the above-named defendant to appear before this court on 5-1-1988 at 10 a.m. personally or through an authorjsed agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which an *ex parte* proceeding will be taken against him.

Given under my hand and seal of the court this 12th day of October, 1987.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Judge Ist Class,
Nalagarh, District Solan.

In the Court of Shri Sita Ram Chaudhary, Assistant Collector 1st Grade, (Tehsildar Sadar) Chamba Himachal Pradesh

Case No. 33/IX/86

Bassessar s/o Ragu r/o village Bagori, Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil and District Chamba, Himachal Pradesh ..*Applicant.*

Versus

1. Jotu s/o Raghu r/o Bagori, Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil & District Chamba, 2. Smt. Tulsi d/o Raghu w/o Sohan Lal Village Kumharka, Pargana Dhundi Tehsil, & District Chamba, 3. Smt. Bago d/o Raghu w/o Narad Village Samiyali (Gand Dehra) Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil&District Chamba, 4. Hem Raj s/o Prem Lal Village Bagori, Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil & District Chamba, 5. Smt. Sheela d/o Prem Lal w/o Chain Lal Village Mowa Pargana Rajnagar Tehsil & District Chamba, 6. Smt. Muthi widow of Prem Lal Village Bagori, Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil & District Chamba, 7. Lokender s/o Nand Lal Village Bagori Pargana Rajnagar Tehsil & District Chamba, 8. Vidya Dhar r/o Surjan, Village Bagori, Pargana Rajnagar, Tehsil & District Chamba.

Application for partition of land bearing Khata No. 135 Khatauni No. 165 to 169 measuring 32-3 bigha situated in Mohal Kiani, Tehsil Land District Chamba.

Whereas in the above noted case, it has been proved to ihe satisfaction of this court that the above named respondents cannot be served in the ordinary course of service as the summons issued several time in their names have come back unserved. Hence this proclamation

under Order 5, Rule 20, C.P.C. is hereby issued against them requiring the above named respondents to appear in this court on 20-1-88 at 10 A.M. personally or through an authorised agent or pleader to defend the case, failing which an *ex parte* proceedings shall be taken against them.

Given under my hand and seal of the this court today the 11th December, 1987.

Seal. SITA RAM CHAUDHARY,
Assistant Collector 1st Grade,
Chamba, District Chamba,

ब अदालत श्री डी0 एस0 नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, चौपाल, तहसील चौपाल, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

उनवान मुकद्दमा :

श्रीमती बुधि देवी पत्नी श्री भागीरथ, वासी ग्राम चौपाल, परगना चाजू, तहसील चौपाल ..फ्रीक अव्वल।

बनाम

गुरदीता मल, जिला होशियारपुर

मुकद्दमा बाला में उपरोक्त व्यक्ति को सूचित किया जाता है कि बार-बार नोटिस जारी किए जाने पर भी श्री गुरदीता मल हाजिर नहीं आया है और सही पता न होने के कारण तामील नहीं हो रही है। इसलिए बजरिया इश्तहार राजपत्र द्वारा श्री गुरदीता मल को सूचित किया जाता है कि मुकद्दमा सेहत इन्द्राज में अगर कोई उजर/कार्यवाही करना चाहता हो तो वे इस सम्बन्ध में दिनांक 20-1-88 को अदालत हजा में असालतन या वकालतन हाजर हो कर उजर कर सकता है। अन्यथा कार्यवाही यक तरफा हस्ब जावता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 22-12-1987 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। डी0 एस0 नेगी,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
चौपाल, जिला शिमला।

ब अदालत जनाब श्री विनोद गोयल, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मि0 नं0 35 तारीख मरजुआ 28-7-86

श्री रोशन लाल पुत्र परशोतम, निवासी कजौण, तहसील करसोग।

बनाम

1. मु0 देवकी विधवा कर्म चन्द, निवासी पुराना बाजार, सुन्दरनगर, 2. मु0 पुरनी पत्नी नाग उपनाम जमना दास, निवासी पांगणा, 3. सावित्री पत्नी भगत राम, निवासी पुराना बाजार सुन्दरनगर, 4. दौलत राम पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी मुहाल कजौण, तहसील करसोग, 5. नन्द लाल पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी कजौण, 6. लीला धर पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी कजौण, 7. तोया धर पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी कजौण। 8. दीना नाथ पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी कजौग, 9. शांति विधवा दुनी चन्द, निवासी कजौण, 10. खेम राज पुत्र लछमण, निवासी कजौण, 11. गोपाल पुत्र लछमण, निवासी कजौण ..फरीक दोयम।

दरख्वास्त तकसीम भूमि खाता मुश्तरका खाता खतौनी नं0 29।60, खसरा नम्बर 1-2-4-5-6-8-9-10-11-12-13-14-15, कित्ता 13, रकबा तादादी 25-3-4 बीघा वाक्या मुहाल कांणो मन्दलाह।471, इलाका कजौण।

उपरोक्त उनवान बाला में फरीक दोयम सर्व श्रीमती देवकी, सावित्री व सैहनी को बजरिया समन कई बार अदालत हजा में तलब किया गया परन्तु फरीक दोयम पर साधारण तौर पर तामील नहीं हो रही है और अदालत को भी पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि फरीक दोयम की तामील साधारण तौर पर होनी असम्भव है।

अतः फरीक दोयम देवकी, सावित्री, सैहनी को बजरिया इश्तहार जेर आर्डर 5, रूल 20, सी0पी0सी0 सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 18-1-88 को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालत हजा में असालतन या वकालतन हाजर हो कर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें। अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 5-12-87 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। विनोद गोयल,
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
करसोग, जिला मण्डी।

ब अदालत श्री विनोद गोयल, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मि0 नं0 33 28-7-86

तोपाधर पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी मुहाल ममेल, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

श्री बृजलाल उपनाम वलभ, निवासी बखरूण्डा, ईलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी।

श्रीमती सरोज पत्नी प्रकाश चन्द, निवासी बखरूण्डा, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री दौलत राम पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी दखरूण्डा, इलाक कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री नन्द लाल पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी बखरूण्डा, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री दीना नाथ पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी बखरूण्डा, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री लिला धर पुत्र मनी राम, निवासी बखरूण्डा, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

श्री हेत राम, पुत्र हिम्मत राम, निवासी बगैल, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील करसोग।

श्री गोकल पुत्र हिम्मत राम, निवासी बगैल, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील करसोग।

मु0 एशबू विधवा हिमत राम, निवासी बगैल, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील करसोग।

श्री धनी राम पुत्र अमर दत्त, निवासी बगैल, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील करसोग।

श्री जगर नाथ पुत्र अमर दत्त, निवासी बगैल, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील करसोग।

श्री मनी राम पुत्र गंगू, निवासी धलोव, इलाका कजौण ..फरीक दोयम।

दरख्वास्त तकसीम भूमि खाता मुश्तरका भूमि खेबट नं0 खतौनी नं0 47-48-49 ता 51 कित्ता 8 रकबा 10-16-11 बीघा का 1/15 भाग वाक्या मुहाल बखरूण्डा।

उपरोक्त उनवान बाला में फरीक दोयम सर्वश्री हेत राम, एशबू, धनी राम, जगर नाथ को बजरिया समन कई बार तलब किया परन्तु तामील कुनिन्दा की रिपोर्ट से पाया गया कि फरीक दोयम पर साधारण तौर पर तामील नहीं हो रही है और अदालत को भी यह पूर्ण विश्वास हो गया है कि फरीक दोयम की तामील साधारण तरीका से होनी असम्भव है।

अतः फरीक दोयम हेत राम, एशबू, धनी राम, जगर नाथ को बजरिया इश्तहार जेर आर्डर 5, रूल 20, सी0 पी0 सी0 सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 18-1-88 को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालत हजा में असालतन या वकालतन हाजर हो कर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करे अन्यथा उनके खिलाफ एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 5-12-87 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

विनोद गोयल,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, करसोग,
तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी ।

व अदालत जनाब-सब-रजिस्ट्रार बलदेव दास शर्मा-कम-नायब तहसीलदार, कांगड़ा

मुकद्दमा नम्बर आफ 1987

रोशन लाल पुत्र चिपला राम, वासी ओलड़ी, मौजा हटवास

बनाम

सर्व जनता ...प्रत्यार्थी ।

दरख्वास्त बाबत रजिस्ट्री करवाने वसीयत नामा जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय रजिस्ट्रेशन ऐक्ट, 1903 हेतु ।

नाईब शरफ कांगड़ा ।

मुकद्दमा मुन्दरजा उनवान बाला में हर खास व आम को वजरिया मुशतरी मुनादी कर के सूचित करें कि रोशन लाल आदि उपरोक्त ने मिति 13-11-87 को इस कार्यालय में दरख्वास्त दी है कि श्री चिपला राम पुत्र बाली राम, वासी ओलड़ी ने एक वसीयत नामा वहक प्रार्थी के नाम लिखवाया है कि उस की सम्पूर्ण चल व अचल सम्पत्ति उस के मरणों उपरांत प्रार्थी के नाम की जावे जिस की तारीख पेशी 10-2-88 को इस अदालत में रखी गई है। यदि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी को किसी किस्म का उजर या एतराज हो तो वह उपरोक्त तारीख को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत 10 बजे आ कर पेश कर सकता है । इसके बाद कोई उजर काबिले समायत न होगा । अन्यथा गैर-हाजरी में वसीयत पंजीकृत कर दी जायेगी। खर्चा मुशतरी मुनादी मुबलग दो रु0 के रसीदी टिकट लफ हैं ।

आज व तारीख मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

बलदेव दास शर्मा,
सब-रजिस्ट्रार-कम-नायब तहसीलदार,
कांगड़ा ।

इश्तहार जेर आर्डर 5, रूल 20, सी0पी0सी0

व अदालत तहसीलदार भू-व्यवस्था वृत्त ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना

मिसल नं0 154/86 तारीख 28-5-86

श्रीमती रक्षा कुमारी पत्नी किशन कुमार पुत्र मिलखा राम, निवासी गांव बहडाला, जिला ऊना ।

बनाम

1. श्री करतार सिंह, (2) श्री चुहार सिंह, (3) श्री बलवीर सिंह, (4) बलदेव सिंह, (5) अजमेर सिंह, (6) सलीन्द्र सिंह, (7) सोम नाथ पुत्र ज्ञाना, (8) श्रीमती सलोचना पुत्री हाकम, (9) कर्म चन्द, (10) किशन चन्द, (11) माहन सिंह पुत्र सिद्धू पुत्र पाला, (12) श्रीमती गीता देवी विधवा श्री तीर्थ, (13) राम कली, (14) राकेश लता पुत्रीयान तीर्थ, (15) व्यास देव पुत्री तीर्थ, (18) रामकिशन पुत्र मुन्शी, (17) सुभाष पुत्र तीर्थ, (18) विहारी लाल पुत्र मुन्शी, (19) श्रीमती मुखत्यारी, (20) श्रीमती किशनी पुत्री मुन्शी (21), जगदीश चन्द, (22) किशन चन्द, (23) कर्म चन्द पुत्र मुन्शी, (24) श्रीमती समरोतो विधवा मुन्शी, (25) सगली राम, (26) केवल, (27) शक्ति, (28) तरसेम, (29) राम नाथ पुत्र हाकम, (30) शांति देवी, (31) विमला देवी पुत्री हाकम, (32) बिहारी लाल पुत्र प्रशोतम, (33) ओम प्रकाश धर्मपुत्र परमानन्द, (34) मनपाल धर्मपुत्र पुन्नू, (35) श्रीमती द्रोपती विधवा व (36) चिरंजी लाल, (37) सतपाल, (38) राम आसरा, (39) सोमदत्त, (40) श्रीमती शकुन्तला, 41) सुर्दशन पुत्र राम रखा, (42) भगत राम पुत्र रामरखा, (43) श्रीमती सीता देवी पुत्री रामरखा, (44) श्रीमती हुकमो देवी विधवा मौंढी, (45) सरोज रानी, (46) किरन देवी, (47) गोपाल राम, (48) राज कुमार पुत्र मौढी, (49) उत्तम सिंह पुत्र हाकम, (50) जोग राज पुत्र माधो राम, (51) रुलिया, (52) गेन्दा पुत्र सोमा, (53) शादी लाल पुत्र विशम्बर, (54) रखा पुत्र लच्छमण (55) दूर्गा दास, (56) देश राज पुत्र नत्थू, (57) नत्थू, (58) हाकम पुत्र चन्दू, (59) उत्तम सिंह, पुत्र सिद्धू, (60) रुलिया पुत्र हमीरू (61) कश्मीरी लाल पुत्र बेली राम, (62) ओंकार सिंह, (63) मदन लाल पुत्र दीनानाथ, (64) श्रीमती पदमावती पुत्री सालिग राम, (65) श्रीमती भागवती विधवा सालिग राम, (66) पृथी चन्द पुत्र भगत राम, (67) भगत राम पुत्र गुरदीता, (68) रामनाथ पुत्र बेली राम, निवासी गांव बहडाला, तहसील व जिला ऊना । ...प्रतिवादीगण ।

प्रार्थना पत्र तकसीम भूमि बाबत खाता नम्बर 548, किता 58, कुल रकबा 103 कनाल, मौजा बहडाला जमाबन्दी साल 1979-80, तहसील व जिला ऊना । इस केस का तकसीम का फैसला (आदेश) अन्तिम दिनांक 8-1-88 को पारित इस अदालत द्वारा करना है । इस सम्बन्ध में उक्त प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन भेजे गए मगर रिपोर्ट तामील साधारण रूप से न हो रही है । अतः उक्त प्रतिवादीगण 1 ता 68 को वजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है । कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु दिनांक 8-1-88 समय 10 बजे हमारी अदालत मुकाम ऊना में असालतन या वकालतन हाजर आवें अन्यथा कार्यवाही एक तरफा अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

आज दिनांक 2-12-87 को हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार भू-व्यवस्था वृत्त,
जिला ऊना ।

व अदालत श्री आई0 डी0 सोनी, तहसीलदार व अख्यार सहायक कुलैक्टर दर्जा दोयम, बंगाणा, जिला ऊना

श्री सुरेन्द्र पाल, ओंकार नाथ, विजय कुमार, अनिल कुमार, पिसनरान राम दास, रतन चन्द सुपुत्र ठाकर दास, वासी ऊना, तहसील ऊना, जिला ऊना (मालकान) ।

बनाम

खुशिया, मवरू, बंसी, ज्ञानू पिसरान, सयामा व प्रीतम चन्द सुपुत्र सन्ता, वासी तलेहड़ा सनहाल, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना

...गैर मौरूसीयान ।

तस्दीक इन्तकालात नम्बर 649, 650, 651, 653, 652 व 654 वाक्या टीका तलेहड़ा सनहाल, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना ।

उपरोक्त इन्तकालात मिनजानब मालकान बहक गैर मौरूसीयान दर्ज हो कर इस न्यायालय में जेर फैसला है । मालकान को कई बार इस न्यायालय से इतलाह बराये हाजरी बरवक्त तस्दीक इन्तकाल भेजी गई लेकिन मालकान पर तामील न हो सकी । रिपोर्ट है कि यह मालकान कहीं बाहर रहते हैं जिनके सही एड्रेस का पता न है । अब अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि इन मालकान पर साधारण तरीका से तामील होना कठिन है ।

अतः इश्तहार हजा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि मालकान को इन्तकालात तस्दीक पर आपत्ति हो तो वे इश्तहार हजा के छपने के तीस दिन के भीतर हाजिर अदालत हो कर उजर पेश कर सकते हैं । बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई उजर काबिल समायत न होगा और इन्तकालात बहक गैर-मौरूसीयान तस्दीक कर दिए जावेगें ।

आज दिनांक 8-12-87 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। आई0 डी0 सोनी,
सहायक कुलैक्टर दर्जा दोयम, बंगाणा,
जिला ऊना।

न्यायालय मण्डलायुक्त, कांगड़ा मण्डल, धर्मशाला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

दिनांक 18-12-1987

रैवेन्यू अपील नं 0 228।86

जोगेश्वर उर्फ जगदीशू ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

अमर नाथ इत्यादि ..प्रतिवादी।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने अपील विरुद्ध आदेश भू-व्यवस्था अधिकारी, कांगड़ा स्थित धर्मशाला दिनांक 26-7-1986 के इस न्यायलय में कर रखी है जिसमें प्रतिवादी (1) श्री बलदेव, (2) बन्सी राम, (3) वेद प्रकाश सब पुत्र श्री जोग राज, निवासी पठियार, तहसील कांगड़ा, जिला कांगड़ा, बार-बार समन जारी करने के बावजूद भी अदालत में हाजर नहीं आ रहे हैं। इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि इनकी तामील साधारण तौर पर नही हो सकती है। अतः उन्हें इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि दिनांक 7-1-88 को बवक्त 10 बजे धर्मशाला हमारी अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजर आवें अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जायेगी।

मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 18-12-87 को जारी होवें।

मोहर। एस0 एस0 परमार,
मण्डलायुक्त, कांगड़ा मण्डल, धर्मशाला।

ब कार्यालय श्री विश्वानाथ गुप्ता, सब-रजिस्ट्रार, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

भूरा राम आदि बनाम आम जनता

उनवान: प्रार्थना-पत्र बराये पंजीकृत किये जाने वसीयतनामा मुतवफी फिजू राम पुत्र चितु राम, वासी नेरी, तप्पा मैंहल, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

जेर धारा 40।41 भारतीय रजिस्ट्रेशन ऐक्ट, 1908

नोटिस बनाम:—आम जनता।

उपर्युक्त उनवान वाला में श्री भूरा राम पुत्र सीतू राम ने प्रार्थना पत्र पेश किया है कि फिजू राम मुतवफी उपर्युक्त ने वसीयतनामा 23-3-1987 को तहरीर करवाया है उसे पंजीकृत किया जाये। इस लिये इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति को इस वसीयत के पंजीकृत होने में एतराज हो तो वह हमारे कार्यालय में असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 11-2-88 प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आकर पेश करें। बाद में कोई एतराज न सुना जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 15-12-87 को मेरे दस्तखत व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। विश्वानाथ गुप्ता,
सब-रजिस्ट्रार, भोरंज,
जिला हमीरपुर।

कार्यालय श्री विश्वा नाथ गुप्ता, सब-रजिस्ट्रार, भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मनशा राम आदि बनाम आम जनता

उनवान:—प्रार्थनापत्र बराये पंजीकृत किए जाने वसीयतनामा मुतवफी श्रीमती रौणकू देवी बेवा श्री देवी राम, वासी फगलोट, तप्पा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय रजिस्ट्रेशन ऐक्ट, 1908

नोटिस बनाम:—आम जनता।

उपर्युक्त उनवान बाला के बारे में श्री मन्शा राम ने प्रार्थनापत्र पेश किया है कि उपर्युक्त मुतवफी श्रीमती रौणकू देवी ने वसीयतनामा दिनांक 16-9-87 को तहरीर करवाया था उसे पंजीकृत किया जावे। इसलिये इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति को इस वसीयत के पंजीकृत होने में कोई एतराज हो तो वह हमारे कार्यालय में असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 11-2-88 को प्रातः 10 बजे हाजिर आकर पेश करें। अन्यथा वसीयतनामा पंजीकृत कर दिया जावेगा।

आज दिनांक 15-12-87 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी होवें।

मोहर। विश्वानाथ गुप्ता,
सब-रजिस्ट्रार, भोरंज।
जिला हमीरपुर।

ब अदालत श्री पुना राम कासव, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील सदर।

ब मुकदमा:

श्री बृजलाल सुपुत्र बलीभद्र, वासी रियूर, इलाका बगड़ा, तहसील सदर ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

सर्वश्री (1) बल्लभ, (2) विष्नु पुत्रान व (3) मु0 कामी, पुत्री नोखू, (4) भादरू उर्फ व्यासदेव, (5) मु0 कलावती, (6) मु0 लीलावती पुत्रियां सुख, वासी मलेटा, इलाका बल्ह, तहसील सदर .. प्रत्यार्थीगण।

दरख्वास्त बराये सेहत गिरदावरी वाक्या मुहाल, रियूर, तहसील सदर।

मुकदमा उनवान वाला में फरीकदोयम को अदालत से अनेक बार समन द्वारा तलब किया जा चुका है लेकिन जानबूझ कर तामील समन से गुरेज करते हैं। इसलिए अदालत हज़ा को पूरा विश्वास हो चुका है कि प्रत्यार्थीगण पर साधारण तौर से तामिल होनी असम्भव है। इसलिए फरीक दोयम बल्लभ आदि को बजरिया इश्तहार सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 8-1-88 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजर होकर पैरवी मुकदमा करें। बसूरत दीगर इनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही एक तरफा अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 15-12-87 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर द्वारा इश्तहार अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। पुना राम कासव,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील सदर जिला मण्डी।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन

शून्य

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

शून्य

अनुपूरक

शून्य

PART I

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 20th November, 1987

No. Fish. C(17)1/79.—Whereas it appears to the Governor, Himachal Pradesh that land is required to be taken by the Government at the public expense, for a public purpose, namely for construction of a kuhl to supply regular water to the Fisheries Farm at Deoli, District Bilaspur, H. P., it is hereby notified that land in the locality described below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

2. This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

4. Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of the said land in the locality may, within thirty days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Collector, Sadar, District Bilaspur H. P.

SPECIFICATION

District: BILASPUR *Tehsil:* SADAR

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big.	Area Bis.
1	2	3	4
DEOLI	253/2	0	1
	253/4	0	4
	251/1	0	1
Total kitta ..		0	6

Shimla-2, the 20th November, 1987

No. Fish. C(17)-1/79.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Himachal Pradesh that the land is required to be taken by the Government at the public expenses for a public purpose, namely for the construction of kuhl to supply regular water to the Fisheries Farm at Deoli, District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh, it is hereby declared that land in the locality described below is needed to be required for the said purpose.

The declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provision of section 7 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Collector, Bilaspur is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

The plan of the land may be inspected in the office of the Collector. Land Acquisition (S.D.M.), Sadar Bilaspur.

SPECIFICATION

District: BILASPUR *Tehsil:* SADAR

Village	Khasra No.	Area Big.	Area Bis.
1	2	3	4
DEOLI	253/2	0	1
	253/4	0	4
	251/1	0	1
		0	6

Sd/-
Secretary.

PART III

HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 29th December, 1987

No. Udyan-Cha(5)18/87.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Himachal Pradesh that the land is required to be taken by the Government at public expenses for a public purpose, namely for canstruction of Integrated Corrugated Box Making Plant at Khoru, Tehsil Kotkhai, District Shimla, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

The declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern and under the provisions of section 7 of the said Act, the Collector, Land Acquisition, (S.D.M.), Theog, Sub-Division Theog is hereby directed to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

A plan of the land may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Land Acquisition (S. D. M.) Theog, Sub Division Theog.

SPECIFICATION

District: SHIMLA *Tehsil:* KOTKHAI

Chak	Khasra No.	Area Big.	Area Bis.
1	2	3	4
KHORU	101	0	6
	102	0	15
	163	1	0
	168	2	0
	197	1	3
	198/1	0	16
	198/2	0	11
	222	4	1
	354/235	2	15
	131	0	10
	112	1	3
	103	0	4
	104	1	2
	113	7	4
	128	0	7
	129	1	16

1	2	3	4
	158	1	1
	105	1	19
	319/106	1	3
	320/106	1	4
	321/106	1	3
	107	2	1
	108	0	12
	127	0	8
	109	5	17
	110	1	19
	111	5	4
	121	1	10
	122	1	0
	137	2	12
	143	1	7
	123	0	15
	369/123/1	2	2
	125	1	1
	136	6	14
	126	4	2
	133	2	14
	144	5	11
	130	1	10
	134	0	1
	135	1	12
	145	2	12
	146	3	16
	146/1	0	17
	147	5	0
	148	3	6
	150	7	10
	153	0	13
	155	0	9
	154	1	2
	156	2	8
	324/157	1	3
	325/157	2	10
	159	2	19
	160	2	13
	301/161	2	6
	302/161	3	1
	162	2	15
	167/1	1	14
	170/1	0	10
	173/1	1	4
	173/2	1	14
	194	1	0
	389/195	0	13
	237/1	1	2
	391/195/1	0	6
	238	1	0
	392/195/1	0	12
	360/236	1	2
	358/236	2	11
	356/236	0	1
	221	1	5
	250	1	14
	223	4	8
	249/1	1	0
	247	0	17
	248	0	18
	140	1	1
	151	1	7
	152	1	3
	171	1	0
	172	0	12
	174	2	14
	370/123/1	0	8
Total kitta	84	157	16

By order,
Sd/-
Financial Commissioner Dev.-cum-APC.

PART V

ब न्यायालय श्री सोहन लाल सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी, नायब-तहसीलदार, सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मि0 नं0 9/1-3-1986

ब मुकद्दमा :

अमर चन्द पुत्र श्री मोलक राम, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

बौणा पुत्र गोविन्दा पुत्र फतू 2. लहड़ू पुत्र गोबिन्दा 3. शेठल पुत्र गोविन्दा, गिरजा नन्द पुत्र मोलक, वेद प्रकाश पुत्र गिरजा नन्द, चन्दर प्रकाश पुत्र गिरजा नन्द, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, अननापूर।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में फरीक दोयम को कई बार इस न्यायालय से समन जारी हुए लेकिन उन पर तामील समन नहीं हो रही है तथा न्यायालय को भी विश्वास हो चुका है कि उन पर तामील समन साधारण तरीका से होनी कठिन है अतः समस्त फरीक दोयम को बजरिया इश्तहार हजा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 11-1-88 को समय 10 बजे सुबह हमारे न्यायालय सरकाघाट में हाजर होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 23-12-87 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सोहन लाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी।

ब न्यायालय श्री सोहन लाल सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी नायब-तहसीलदार सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0।

मुकद्दमा नम्बर 10/1-3-86

बमुकद्दमा :

अमर चन्द पुत्र मोलक राम, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

श्री गिरजा नन्द पुत्र मोलक राम, 2. धनजै पुत्र मोलक राम, 3. वेद प्रकाश पुत्र गिरजा नन्द 4. चन्द्र प्रकाश पुत्र गिरजानन्द, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, तहसील सरकाघाट जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में फरीक दोयम को कई बार इस न्यायालय से समन जारी हुए लेकिन उन पर तामील समन नहीं हो रही है तथा न्यायालय को भी विश्वास हो चुका है कि उन पर तामील समन साधारण तरीका से होनी कठिन है। अतः समस्त फरीक दोयम को बजरिया इश्तहार हजा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 11-1-88 को समय 10 बजे सुबह हमारे न्यायालय सरकाघाट में हाजर होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करे, अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 17-12-87 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सोहन लाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी।

ब न्यायालय श्री सोहन लाल, सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी, नायब तहसीलदार, सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मि0 नं0 8/1-3-1986

ब मुकद्दमा :

अमर चन्द पुत्र श्री मोलक राम, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

नामेश्वर पुत्र रघुनाथ, गौरीशंकर पुत्र रघुनाथ, गिरजानन्द पुत्र मोलक, धननजै पुत्र मोलक राम, अमर चन्द पुत्र मोलक राम, निवासी धनराशी, इलाका धाड़ता, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी।

1. अच्छरू पुत्र गुरमुख, 2. सौजा पुत्र गुरमुख—कांशी राम पुत्र पूर्विया, सीता देवी विधवा रूप लाल, अमर सिंह पुत्र रूप लाल, कुलदीप पुत्र रूप लाल शकुन्तला पुत्री रूप लाल निवासी गांव धनराशी, राम चन्द पुत्र काहना निवासी गांव धनराशी, मेला राम पुत्र फांदी, रण सिंह पुत्र फांदी, कश्मीर सिंह पुत्र फांदी, बालम पुत्र फांदी, कुमारी लीला पुत्री फांदी, कलां विधवा फांदी चौधरी पुत्र दिवान चन्द, नेक राम, ख्याली राम पुत्र रामदेई पुत्री सतवाजू विध्वा नरैणू, निवासी धनराशी, चुनी लाल पुत्र पूर्विया, ज्ञान चन्द, सन्ती देवी विधवा पूर्विया, कलासो विधवा भगवान दास, निवासी धनराशी प्रभी विधावा रामदास, वाली राम पुत्र सैनू, नेक राम धर्म चन्द पुत्र खलैलू देवी पुत्री सरवनू, विध्वा रेलू निवासी धनराशी, इलाका अनन्तपुर।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में फरीक दोयम को कई बार इस न्यायालय से समन जारी हुए लेकिन उन पर तामील समन नहीं हो रही है तथा न्यायालय को भी विश्वास हो चुका है कि उन पर तामील समन साधारण तरीका से होनी कठिन है अतः समस्त फरीक दोयम को बजरिया इश्तहार हजा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 11-1-88 को समय 10 बजे सुबह हमारे न्यायालय सरकाघाट में हाजर होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 23-12-87 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सोहन लाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी, सरकाघाट,
जिला मण्डी।

ब न्यायालय श्री सोहन लाल, सब-रजिस्ट्रार सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

दिनेश कुमार पुत्र रघूवीर सिंह, निवासी कनवालग, इलाका सुंराणा, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

आम जनता

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने हमारे समक्ष प्रार्थना पत्र बगर्ज तस्दीक व रजिस्टर्ड किये जाने वसीयत जो कि उसकी दादी श्रीमती राधा देवी बेवा संगारू, गांव सरकाघाट कनवालग, इलाका सुंराणा ने मिति 18-3-87 को तहरीर करवाई है पेश किया। अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त वसीयत के तस्दीक व रजिस्टर्ड होने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन हमारे न्यायालय स्थान सरकाघाट में हाजर होकर दिनांक 11-1-88 को समय 10 बजे प्रातः पेश करे अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 17-12-87 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सोहन लाल,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी।

ब अदालत सब रजिस्ट्रार सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बमुकद्दमा :

श्री गंगा राम पुत्र नरैण सिंह, निवासी मरी, इलाका कमलाह, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

..प्रत्यार्थी।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने हमारे समक्ष प्रार्थना पत्र बगर्ज तस्दीक व रजिस्टर्ड किए जाने वसीयत जो कि उसके चाचा मुन्शी राम पुत्र जोध सिंह, निवासी वनाल, धर्मपुर, इलाका कमलाह ने दिनांक 9-2-1986 को तहरीर करवाई है पेश किया अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त वसीयत के तस्दीक व रजिस्टर्ड होने में कोई आपत्ती हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन हमारे न्यायालय स्थान सरकाघाट में हाजर होकर दिनांक 11-1-88 समय 10 बजे प्रातः पेश करे। अन्यथा कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

हस्ताक्षर हमारे व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 17-12-87 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सोहन लाल,
सब रजिस्ट्रार, सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी।

In the Court of Shri Surindra Prakash, District Judge Shimla, Sessions Division at Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.

CASE No. 12-S/2 OF 1987.

1. Smt. Leela Devi widow of late Shri Sham Lal, resideut of village and Post office Junga, Pargana Parali. Tehsil Junga, District Shimla.
2. Shri Sunil (minor son of late Shri Sham Lal).
3. Kumari Nushu (minor daughter of late Shri Sham Lal)
4. Shri Anil, son (minor son of late Shri Sham Lal)

All through their natural Guardian Smt. Leela Devi Petitioner No. 1 widow of late Shri Sham Lal, resident of village and post office Junga, Pargana Parali, Tehsil Junga, District Shimla. ..Petitioners.

Versus

General public ..Respondent.

To

The general public

Whereas in the above noted case the petitioners have moved an application under Section 372 of the Indian Succession Act, for the grant of succession certificate in respect of debts and securities in respect of late Shri Sham Lal resident of village and post office Junga Tehsil Junga, District Shimla, who died on 1-8-1987 in village Chauri (Junga), with respect to his F. D. R. No. AF/05/481238-6/83, dated 5-2-1983 likely to mature on 5-5-1988 to the tune of Rs. 10,000/- and saving Bank Account No. 69 in UCO Bank, Junga, Tehsil Junga, District Shimla, to the tune of Rs. 31, 480.15 paise amount payable up to October, 1987.

Notice is hereby issued to the general public that if any well-wisher or kinsman of the deceased said Sham Lal want to contest the above application, he/they should either personally or through an authorised Agent or pleader, appear in this court on or before 5-1-1988 at 10.00 A. M. and should file the objection, if any, failing which the petition shall be heard and decided *ex-parte*.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this 10th day of December, 1987.

Seal.

Sd/-
District and Session Judge, Shimla.

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला-5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित ।